



**NORTH CAROLINA CENTER FOR
PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH INC.**

For release on Tuesday,
Aug. 31, 1993. May be broadcast
Tuesday A.M. and may appear in
Tuesday A.M. and P.M. newspapers

For more information, call
Mike McLaughlin at the Center
at (919) 832-2839

N.C. Center Says State Should Prepare for Demographic Changes

State policymakers should adopt a strategic planning process to address demographic changes revealed in the 1990 Census, says the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research. The Center, in the latest edition of its quarterly magazine, North Carolina Insight, analyzes census data with an eye toward policy implications of the census for the state. Out of this analysis comes a recommendation that state government engage in a systematic strategic planning process that takes into account key fiscal and demographic trends.

"Strategic planning makes sense for two reasons," says Insight editor Mike McLaughlin. "It would help policymakers develop a consensus on pressing state issues, and it would help them set priorities in preparing a state budget. The result could be a more responsive state government that deals more effectively with the problems facing North Carolina."

The Center's analysis focuses on four trends with broad policy implications for the state. They are: the aging of the state's population; the growth in urban counties' economies and decline in rural economies; the state's changing racial and ethnic mix; and the lack of real progress on reducing poverty.

Here's the future North Carolina faces if state policymakers fail to act on these four trends:

- skyrocketing costs in the state Medicaid program as more of the state's elderly move into expensive institutional care;
- a two-tier state economy with booming urban areas but economically depressed rural areas with ever-declining populations;
- more citizens of Hispanic origin facing health-care problems and limited job prospects because of language barriers;
- a permanent underclass dependent on taxpayers for income, food, housing, and health care if poverty is not addressed.

"In each of these areas, the state faces challenges that will tax its resources and resourcefulness," says McLaughlin. "We can plan for these challenges or get flattened by them."

Rural Economies and Population Down, Urban Counties Up

Among the most troubling trends evident in the census data is the widening prosperity gap between rural and urban areas. During the 1980s, predominantly rural counties had higher poverty rates, lower per capita incomes, and lower population growth than

urban counties. And while all urban counties gained population during the 1980s, 19 rural counties lost population. All but four of these counties are in or near the Coastal Plain -- even though counties with actual oceanfront were among the state's fastest growing counties.

"Take the resort counties out and you really have a bleak picture," says Bud Skinner, senior researcher for the N.C. Rural Economic Development Center. The rural counties had a poverty rate of 16.4 percent in 1990. Urban counties averaged 10.4 percent. All 20 counties with poverty rates above 20 percent were rural.

Rural Anson County, for example, lost 8.5 percent of its population in the 1980s. Anson's leaders say citizens leaving the county are the ones who should be securing its future -- educated young workers. "You lose your income earners, and on the other hand, you keep your poor, your elderly, your indigent. You get a shift to a service-consuming population," says former County Commissioner Gene Russell of Ansonville.

As a result, fewer taxpayers provide more services. That pushes taxes higher and breeds resistance to taxpayer investment in the infrastructure needed to attract industry and keep young people at home. Senator Marc Basnight, President Pro Tempore of the N.C. Senate, represents several poor, rural counties as well as fast-growing Dare County. He recalled visiting Mattamuskeet High School in Hyde County last year. "Every senior I talked with was leaving after graduation," says Basnight.

Urban counties, on the other hand, offer a sharp contrast. Mecklenburg -- with its surging financial services industry leading the way -- added 107,163 residents during the 1980s, a growth rate of more than 26 percent. The county ended the decade with the state's second highest per capita income at \$16,910 a year, behind only Wake's \$17,195. But even for urban counties, the 1980s weren't all gravy. Growth has its costs in increased traffic, pollution, crime, and greater fiscal demands to provide services for sprawling and increasingly diverse populations.

Adding to the strain on infrastructure is a baby boomlet projected to swell the number of school-age children from about 1.6 million in 1990, to 1.7 million by the year 2000. By 2010, the Office of State Planning expects this swell to subside, and the number of school-age children to return to about 1.6 million. But the increase, along with population growth, may mean heavy spending for school construction for parts of the state. Wake County voters, for example, approved \$200 million in bonds for school construction in a June 1993 referendum. Mecklenburg has a \$195 million bond issue on the ballot for the fall.

The Graying of the State's Population

Another dramatic demographic shift revealed in the census data is the graying of the state's population. During the 1980s, the number of North Carolina citizens over age 65 increased from 603,000 to 800,000, or from 10.2 percent of the population to 12 percent. Planners say even more important is a 55 percent jump in the elderly over 85. "The 85-plus are the ones you've got to

watch in terms of consumers of services," says Bill Lamb of the Division of Aging. "That's the long-term care population."

While 95 percent of the state's elderly live independently, those who live in institutions represent a costly expenditure for the state. In 1991, for example, North Carolina state and local governments paid about \$191.9 million in health care services for the poor elderly. Of that amount, about \$119.1 million went for elderly citizens in nursing facilities. That's up from \$65.8 million three years earlier, an 80 percent increase.

The State's Changing Racial and Ethnic Mix

Another area of change is the state's racial and ethnic mix. For years, the state was more than three-quarters white, with almost a quarter black and a small percentage of American Indians. Now other groups are on the increase. Hispanics, for example, total 1.2 percent of the population. Asians and Pacific Islanders have increased to about 0.8 percent. The influx raises questions like: How do you provide services like public education and health care for people who speak little or no English? Or, how do such people acquire a driver's license? (Driver instruction handbooks now are printed only in English).

Hispanics are concentrated in counties with major military installations, counties with labor intensive crops like tobacco and produce, and the state's more urban counties. The trend is that Hispanics are giving up the migrant life for year-round, low-wage jobs. "They spend a fortune to come here and work four or five months. Then they realize, 'Hey, I can go to work in a chicken house or lumber yard and have a paycheck all year round,'" says Mariano Sanchez, migrant parent involvement coordinator for the Yadkin County Schools. The poverty rate for Hispanics is 19.2 percent, far above the state average of 13 percent.

North Carolina's Asian immigrants are clustered in urban counties. Often, they come to the state for college or professional jobs, so they face fewer language barriers.

A Persistent State of Poverty

The state's poverty rate dropped slightly during the decade, from 14.8 percent in 1980 to 13 percent in 1990, 26th in the nation and lower than the rest of the South. But though the rate changed in 1990 -- actually dipping below the national average of 13.1 percent -- some 830,000 people remained below the federal poverty level of \$13,359 in annual income for a family of four. That's only about 10,000 fewer poor people than lived in North Carolina in 1980. Analysts forecast little change in the poverty rate for the foreseeable future.

The state's per capita income increased from \$6,033 a year (83 percent of the national average) in 1979 to \$12,885 a year (89 percent of the national average) in 1989. But not everyone shared equally in that growth. According to census figures, blacks started and ended the decade earning about 55 percent of the income earned by whites. Women also face an earnings gap when compared to men. The gap narrowed slightly during the decade, from 66 cents for each dollar earned by men in 1979 to

70.2 cents for each dollar earned by men in 1989, according to the census. At this pace -- a dime a decade -- women would reach parity with men in the year 2020. Living in a single parent household headed by a female is the greatest predictor of poverty for young children, says demographer Harold Hodgkinson.

Planning for the Future

The four areas examined by the Center -- the rural-urban split, the graying of the population, racial and ethnic diversity, and persistent poverty -- raise a host of issues for state policymakers. Should state government undertake new roles to reverse the decline in rural counties' economies? How will the state manage the cost of Medicaid for elderly citizens in nursing homes? Should the state take another look at its law establishing English as the official state language? What can be done to reduce the number of people in poverty? Should plans be made for public school and college dormitory construction to handle the baby boomlet?

The Center recommends that the state undertake a systematic strategic planning process which takes into account key fiscal and demographic trends. Such a process (as outlined in Senate Bill 252 of the 1993 legislative session) was recommended by the Government Performance Audit Committee as a means of putting the state on a firmer fiscal footing for the future. Financial World magazine has criticized the state for taking a short-term outlook on revenue matters to the neglect of longer-term trends.

The N.C. Center for Public Policy Research is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit corporation created to study public policy issues facing North Carolina and to evaluate state government programs. The Center receives general operating support from the Z. Smith Reynolds and Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundations, 108 corporate contributors, and about 800 individual and organizational members.

In addition to publishing North Carolina Insight magazine, the Center has conducted studies on the cost of running for the state legislature, how the University of North Carolina system evaluates and rewards teaching, ways to increase voter participation, and state regulation of nursing homes. It also publishes a citizen's guide to the legislature, rankings of the effectiveness of all 170 legislators, and rankings of the most influential lobbyists.

Copies of the issue of Insight magazine containing the Center's research on the 1990 Census and North Carolina can be obtained from the Center for \$6.36 plus \$1.50 for postage and handling. To order, call (919) 832-2839, or write the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research, P.O. Box 430, Raleigh, N.C. 27602.

For more information, call Insight Editor Mike McLaughlin at the Center at (919) 832-2839.

**Table 1. N.C. Counties Which
Lost Population in the 1980s or
Are Projected to Lose
Population in the 1990s**

County	Population Loss	
	Actual 1980s	Projected 1990s
1. Alleghany	(0.03)%*	1.36%
2. Anson	8.48	7.28
3. Ashe	0.52	2.12
4. Bertie	3.03	2.43
5. Bladen	6.00	5.06
6. Caswell	0.06	(0.05)
7. Columbus	2.84	3.41
8. Duplin	2.34	1.50
9. Graham	0.29	0.93
10. Greene	4.55	5.41
11. Hertford	3.62	1.73
12. Hyde	7.87	5.69
13. Jones	3.00	9.77
14. Lenoir	4.25	4.29
15. Martin	3.35	3.48
16. Mitchell	(0.03)	1.37
17. Northampton	6.29	5.72
18. Richmond	1.42	0.18
19. Sampson	4.81	6.14
20. Tyrrell	2.99	3.60
21. Washington	5.43	4.94

* () indicates an increase in population

Source: 1990 Census and N.C. Rural Economic Development Center for population losses in 1980s, N.C. State Data Center projections for population losses in 1990s

**Table 4. N.C. Counties with Hispanic
Population Exceeding 1 Percent of
Total Population in County, 1990**

County	Percent Hispanic
1. Chatham	1.46 %
2. Craven	2.23
3. Cumberland	4.84
4. Duplin	2.54
5. Greene	1.10
6. Harnett	1.71
7. Henderson	1.22
8. Johnston	1.55
9. Lee	1.93
10. Lincoln	1.13
11. Mecklenburg	1.31
12. Montgomery	2.38
13. Onslow	5.36
14. Orange	1.36
15. Sampson	1.54
16. Wake	1.27
17. Wayne	1.30
18. Yadkin	1.27
Statewide N.C.	1.16 %

Table 2. County-by-County Census Data on Population, Per Capita Income, and Percentages for Overall Poverty, Children in Poverty, People over 65, and People over 65 in Poverty

County	Population	Per Capita Income	Percent in Poverty	Percent of Children in Poverty	Percent of People Over Age 65	Percent of People Aged 65+ in Poverty
Alamance	108,213 (13) ¹	\$13,290 (16)	8.9 (93)	11.3 (90)	14.8 (29)*	15.9 (82)
Alexander	27,544 (65)	11,624 (38)	9.8 (84)* ²	11.6 (88)	11.0 (88)	24.5 (41)
Alleghany	9,590 (93)	10,237 (66)	20.1 (24)	24.8 (27)*	18.6 (7)	31.7 (7)
Anson	23,474 (70)	9,402 (86)	17.6 (38)	22.9 (33)	15.7 (23)	29.4 (16)
Ashe	22,209 (75)	9,545 (77)	18.4 (35)	21.2 (39)	17.1 (15)*	27.5 (28)
Avery	14,867 (84)	9,729 (75)	14.6 (51)	16.1 (61)*	14.7 (31)*	28.0 (25)
Beaufort	42,283 (48)	10,722 (54)	19.5 (29)	24.8 (27)*	14.9 (27)*	29.1 (18)*
Bertie	20,388 (78)	8,392 (98)	25.9 (3)	35.3 (5)	14.6 (33)	32.3 (6)
Bladen	28,663 (63)	9,497 (79)	21.9 (14)	28.0 (18)*	14.2 (47)*	31.1 (10)
Brunswick	50,985 (42)	11,688 (35)	15.4 (48)	21.3 (38)	14.7 (31)*	17.9 (74)*
Buncombe	174,821 (8)	13,211 (18)	11.4 (71)*	15.0 (68)	16.1 (21)*	15.8 (83)
Burke	75,744 (28)	11,604 (39)	10.1 (81)*	13.0 (79)*	13.0 (65)*	18.8 (69)
Cabarrus	98,935 (19)	13,522 (14)	8.1 (99)	9.7 (96)	13.2 (61)*	15.4 (85)
Caldwell	70,709 (29)	11,522 (42)	10.8 (77)	13.3 (77)*	12.1 (78)	20.5 (60)
Camden	5,904 (98)	10,465 (63)	16.1 (45)	19.5 (48)*	14.0 (50)*	18.9 (68)
Carteret	52,556 (40)	13,227 (17)	11.6 (70)	15.7 (64)	14.3 (40)*	11.9 (98)
Caswell	20,693 (77)	9,817 (73)	16.2 (44)	18.0 (52)	14.3 (40)*	34.5 (3)
Catawba	118,412 (12)	13,764 (12)	7.1(100)	8.9 (98)	12.0 (79)*	12.6 (96)
Chatham	38,759 (52)	13,321 (15)	9.7 (87)	11.7 (86)*	14.4 (38)*	19.8 (62)
Cherokee	20,170 (79)	9,258 (87)	20.4 (20)*	26.2 (22)	19.0 (6)	23.1 (48)
Chowan	13,506 (89)	10,606 (61)	17.7 (37)	23.6 (31)	17.6 (13)*	18.7 (70)
Clay	7,155 (97)	9,456 (83)	17.9 (36)	20.2 (44)	20.3 (5)	25.7 (37)
Cleveland	84,714 (23)	11,875 (31)	11.0 (75)*	14.1 (72)*	13.6 (58)	19.2 (67)
Columbus	49,587 (44)	9,134 (89)	24.0 (9)*	28.7 (14)	13.4 (59)*	37.8 (1)
Craven	81,613 (25)	11,619 (38)	13.6 (58)*	19.5 (48)*	11.2 (86)	17.9 (74)*
Cumberland	274,566 (4)	11,100 (48)	14.4 (53)*	20.1 (45)	6.1 (99)	19.7 (63)
Currituck	13,736 (88)	12,630 (23)	10.1 (81)*	13.4 (76)	12.4 (71)*	14.5 (88)

¹() = rank, ²* asterisk denotes tie in rank

—table continues on next page

Table 2, continued

County	Population	Per Capita Income	Percent in Poverty	Percent of Children in Poverty	Percent of People Over Age 65	Percent of People Aged 65+ in Poverty
Dare	22,746 (73) ¹	15,107 (6)	8.3 (97)* ²	8.3 (99)	12.5 (70)	10.5 (99)
Davidson	126,677 (10)	12,597 (24)	9.8 (84)*	12.4 (83)	12.0 (79)*	17.8 (76)
Davie	27,859 (64)	14,648 (9)	8.4 (94)*	6.6(100)	13.8 (53)	22.6 (52)
Duplin	39,995 (50)	9,406 (85)	19.1 (30)*	22.3 (34)	14.0 (50)*	28.1 (24)
Durham	181,835 (6)	15,030 (7)	11.9 (69)	15.3 (67)	10.7 (89)*	15.6 (84)
Edgecombe	56,558 (38)	9,530 (78)	20.9 (18)	28.4 (16)*	12.3 (74)*	29.0 (20)
Forsyth	265,878 (5)	16,151 (3)	10.5 (79)*	14.9 (69)	12.2 (76)*	14.6 (87)
Franklin	36,414 (56)	10,959 (50)	14.5 (52)	17.1 (56)*	13.4 (59)*	27.3 (29)
Gaston	175,093 (7)	12,477 (25)	10.6 (78)	14.1 (72)*	12.0 (79)*	17.5 (77)*
Gates	9,305 (95)	11,561 (40)	15.7 (47)	20.4 (41)*	14.6 (33)*	22.9 (49)*
Graham	7,916 (96)	8,877 (94)	24.9 (7)	34.9 (6)	16.1 (21)*	25.1 (39)
Granville	38,345 (53)	10,939 (51)	13.5 (60)*	16.9 (58)	12.4 (71)*	26.7 (32)
Greene	15,384 (83)	9,567 (76)	19.1 (30)*	27.8 (20)	12.3 (74)*	27.6 (27)
Guilford	347,420 (3)	15,373 (5)	10.1 (81)*	13.3 (77)*	11.9 (82)	13.2 (91)*
Halifax	55,516 (39)	8,980 (91)	25.6 (4)	36.5 (2)	14.3 (40)*	26.2 (34)*
Harnett	67,822 (31)	10,053 (68)	17.5 (39)	21.7 (37)	11.7 (83)*	26.1 (36)
Haywood	46,942 (46)	11,731 (34)	12.7 (64)	15.4 (66)	18.2 (10)	16.8 (79)
Henderson	69,285 (30)	13,702 (13)	10.5 (79)*	15.9 (63)	21.9 (3)	10.0(100)
Hertford	22,523 (74)	9,016 (90)	25.0 (5)*	36.4 (3)	14.6 (33)*	26.8 (30)*
Hoke	22,856 (72)	8,688 (96)	21.1 (17)	28.8 (13)	9.3 (95)*	28.2 (23)
Hyde	5,411 (99)	9,434 (84)	24.0 (9)*	36.2 (4)	16.6 (20)	23.4 (46)
Iredell	92,931 (21)	13,000 (20)	9.4 (91)*	11.7 (86)*	13.2 (61)*	16.7 (80)
Jackson	26,846 (66)	10,326 (65)	16.7 (42)	17.9 (53)	13.8 (53)*	22.3 (55)
Johnston	81,306 (26)	11,839 (33)	14.3 (55)	16.6 (59)*	12.6 (68)*	29.9 (12)*
Jones	9,414 (94)	8,832 (95)	20.2 (23)	24.7 (29)	14.3 (40)*	25.4 (38)
Lee	41,374 (49)	12,042 (29)	14.7 (50)	20.4 (41)*	13.1 (64)	18.5 (73)
Lenoir	57,274 (36)	10,647 (59)	20.0 (25)	28.0 (18)*	13.7 (56)*	26.8 (30)*
Lincoln	50,319 (43)	12,440 (26)	9.6 (88)*	12.8 (81)	11.7 (83)*	17.5 (77)*
McDowell	35,681 (57)	10,516 (62)	11.4 (71)*	11.9 (84)*	14.4 (38)*	18.6 (71)*

¹ () = rank, ²* asterisk denotes tie in rank

Table 2, continued

County	Population	Per Capita Income	Percent in Poverty	Percent of Children in Poverty	Percent of People Over Age 65	Percent of People Aged 65+ in Poverty
Macon	23,499 (69) ¹	11,017 (49)	16.5 (43)	20.0 (46)	22.5 (2)	21.5 (58)
Madison	16,953 (81)	9,149 (88)	20.4 (20)* ²	22.2 (35)	16.7 (19)	36.0 (2)
Martin	25,078 (68)	9,486 (80)	22.3 (12)	28.9 (12)	14.5 (37)	31.0 (11)
Mecklenburg	511,433 (1)	16,910 (2)	9.6 (88)*	13.0 (79)*	9.3 (95)*	13.2 (91)*
Mitchell	14,433 (85)	10,219 (67)	16.0 (46)	17.1 (56)*	17.7 (12)	29.9 (12)*
Montgomery	23,346 (71)	10,695 (57)	14.4 (53)*	19.6 (47)	13.7 (56)*	21.0 (59)
Moore	59,013 (35)	14,934 (8)	11.1 (74)	16.6 (59)*	20.8 (4)	12.4 (97)
Nash	76,677 (27)	12,684 (22)	13.6 (58)*	17.2 (55)	12.4 (71)*	23.9 (44)
New Hanover	120,284 (11)	13,863 (11)	14.0 (56)	19.3 (51)	12.6 (68)*	13.2 (91)*
Northampton	20,798 (76)	8,244 (99)	23.6 (11)	32.7 (9)	16.8 (17)*	28.4 (22)
Onslow	149,838 (9)	10,713 (56)	12.1 (67)	16.1 (61)*	4.5(100)	19.3 (65)*
Orange	93,851 (20)	15,776 (4)	13.9 (57)	10.1 (93)	8.7 (97)	13.0 (95)
Pamlico	11,372 (90)	10,665 (58)	18.9 (32)	22.1 (36)	16.8 (17)*	23.3 (47)
Pasquotank	31,298 (59)	10,718 (55)	19.7 (26)*	26.8 (21)	13.9 (52)	22.4 (53)*
Pender	28,855 (62)	11,460 (43)	17.2 (40)	24.6 (30)	14.3 (40)*	22.8 (51)
Perquimans	10,477 (92)	9,821 (72)	21.5 (15)*	33.7 (7)	18.3 (9)	21.6 (57)
Person	30,180 (60)	11,158 (47)	13.0 (63)	17.3 (54)	14.2 (47)*	22.4 (53)*
Pitt	107,924 (15)	11,642 (36)	22.1 (13)	25.3 (25)	9.9 (93)	28.9 (21)
Polk	14,416 (86)	14,213 (10)	9.6 (88)*	9.9 (95)	24.6 (1)	14.4 (89)
Randolph	106,546 (16)	12,102 (28)	8.3 (97)*	10.0 (94)	12.2 (76)*	16.4 (81)
Richmond	44,518 (47)	9,841 (70)	16.8 (41)	23.0 (32)	14.2 (47)*	24.3 (42)
Robeson	105,179 (17)	8,878 (93)	24.1 (8)	31.7 (11)	10.7 (89)*	32.4 (5)
Rockingham	86,064 (22)	11,546 (41)	12.2 (66)	15.6 (65)	14.3 (40)*	20.3 (61)
Rowan	110,605 (14)	12,018 (30)	9.4 (91)*	11.6 (88)*	15.3 (26)	15.2 (86)
Rutherford	56,918 (37)	11,287 (45)	12.3 (65)	14.8 (70)	15.6 (24)	21.9 (56)
Sampson	47,297 (45)	9,480 (81)	20.7 (19)	25.2 (26)	14.3 (40)	31.2 (9)
Scotland	33,754 (58)	9,768 (74)	18.6 (33)	25.9 (24)	11.1 (87)	24.2 (43)
Stanly	51,765 (41)	11,265 (46)	11.0 (75)*	14.7 (71)	14.6 (33)*	18.6 (71)*
Stokes	37,223 (54)	12,181 (27)	9.8 (84)*	10.4 (91)*	11.5 (85)	29.3 (17)

¹() = rank, ²* asterisk denotes tie in rank

—table continues on next page

Table 2, *continued*

County	Population	Per Capita Income	Percent in Poverty	Percent of Children in Poverty	Percent of People Over Age 65	Percent of People Aged 65+ in Poverty
Surry	61,704 (33) ¹	11,342 (44)	11.4 (71)* ²	12.5 (82)	14.8 (29)*	22.9 (49)*
Swain	11,268 (91)	8,922 (93)	27.6 (2)	33.4 (8)	15.4 (25)	29.8 (14)*
Transylvania	25,520 (67)	12,737 (21)	13.5 (60)*	19.5 (48)*	18.5 (8)	13.1 (94)
Tyrrell	3,856 (100)	7,884 (100)	25.0 (5)*	32.2 (10)	17.6 (13)*	31.6 (8)
Union	84,211 (24)	13,135 (19)	8.4 (94)*	10.4 (94)	9.6 (94)	19.3 (65)*
Vance	38,892 (51)	10,457 (64)	19.6 (28)	26.0 (23)	13.0 (65)*	23.7 (45)
Wake	423,380 (2)	17,195 (1)	8.4 (94)*	9.2 (97)	7.8 (98)	13.9 (90)
Warren	17,265 (80)	8,502 (97)	28.2 (1)	37.1 (1)	17.9 (11)	32.6 (4)
Washington	13,997 (87)	9,827 (71)	20.4 (20)*	28.4 (16)*	13.8 (53)*	27.8 (26)
Watauga	36,952 (55)	10,628 (60)	21.5 (15)*	11.9 (84)*	10.6 (91)	19.4 (64)
Wayne	104,666 (18)	10,843 (52)	15.2 (49)	20.4 (41)*	10.3 (92)	26.2 (34)*
Wilkes	59,393 (34)	10,816 (53)	13.3 (62)	13.5 (75)	13.2 (61)*	29.1 (18)*
Wilson	66,061 (32)	11,641 (37)	19.7 (26)*	28.6 (15)	12.7 (67)	24.9 (40)
Yadkin	30,488 (61)	11,843 (32)	12.0 (68)	14.1 (72)	14.9 (27)*	26.5 (33)
Yancey	15,419 (82)	9,462 (82)	18.7 (34)	20.6 (40)	17.1 (15)*	29.8 (14)*
Statewide						
N.C.	6,628,637	\$12,885	13.0%	16.9%	12.1%	19.5%

¹ () = rank, ²* asterisk denotes tie in rank

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Data